

VZCZCXYZ0025  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0865/01 1091121  
ZNR UUUUU ZZH  
O 191121Z APR 06  
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 5459  
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUCPDOC/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY  
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000865

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCB, L/ACV, IO/S  
SECDEF FOR OSD/ISP  
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC  
COMMERCE FOR BIS (GOLDMAN)  
NSC FOR DICASAGRANDE  
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PARAM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)

SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC): WRAP-UP FOR  
WEEK ENDING APRIL 14

This is CWC-32-06.

-----  
ARTICLE VII  
-----

¶1. (U) Facilitator Maarten Lak (Netherlands) chaired a April 10 informal consultation on the Implementation Support Branch's Article VII-related program. Magda Bauta (TS/Cuba) made a detailed presentation (faxed back to ISN/CB) of her branch's program, primarily pointing out where she lacked funds for Technical Assistance Visits (TAVs) due to the demands of the regional and sub-regional meetings of National Authorities (NA) and lack of voluntary contributions in 2006.

Colombia made a long impassioned intervention supporting the IPB plan, emphasizing the importance of regional and sub-regional meetings in the GRULAC. Such meetings bring together a large number of States Parties, all of whom can simultaneously receive a message regarding the importance of implementation. Such meetings also strengthen multilateralism, of key importance of GRULAC.

¶2. (U) Tunisia then asked why so many workshops were planned for Asia and none for Africa. The response: IPB hoped to have a thematic meeting in Africa, but funds were not available. Several Asian states made voluntary contributions to support the meetings there. Further, Tunisia questioned Bauta's statement that attendees are carefully screened: why aren't these workshops, seminars and meetings open to any representative of any state that wants to attend? Bauta responded that indeed these are open, but for sponsorship, IPB wants to ensure the correct people attend.

¶3. (U) Germany, supported by France, questioned the presentation's statistics, wondering why TS bilateral outreach efforts in Brussels and London were characterized as TAVs. Germany reiterated its April 6 demand for a complete calendar of activities, and asked about the National Authority discussion forum initiated a year ago. (NAs did not use it). Italy noted the CSP-10 decision, emphasizing that IPB needed to refocus its efforts as directed in the decision. The U.S., supported by Italy and the UK, also questioned IPB's strategy, noting that to accomplish the goals set out by CSP-10, there are only a few months left. Bilateral exchanges with one or two representatives on the

margins of regional and subregional meetings of NAs are good for status checks, if the state has a NA. However, to make significant progress, teams of relevant experts must go to capitals to meet with members of all relevant agencies.

¶4. (U) The U.S. also questioned the budgetary assumptions set out in the IPB briefing: not all TAVs require 3 TS staff (the U.S. pays for its own attendees). Why couldn't the TS incorporate more national experts, so that TS costs are reduced? Given the budget surpluses of recent years, had IPB considered asking the OPCW budget office on a quarterly basis if there were surplus funds elsewhere which could be used to support TAVs? (ICA Division chief Makhubalo replied that no, that would require going to the Director General. Makhubalo asserted that it is better to solicit voluntary contributions.) Canada noted that voluntary contributions have increased IPB's budget by almost 80 percent, and wondered why it still was not enough to cover TAVs to the capitals of all requesting states. Norway disagreed, stating that if states are willing to contribute more money, IPB should not be taken to task for its attempts to balance its implementation priorities.

-----  
ARTICLE X  
-----

¶5. (U) Consultations under facilitator Hans Schramml (Austria) were held on April 11, and discussions centered on paragraph 5 language provided by the UK and the Canadian proposal on Assistance and Protection Bureau programs. The TS gave an overview of the status of the database: while the

SIPDIS  
database is functionally ready, questions for delegations remain. In particular, a criteria needs to be established to designate what information will be integrated into the database and who should be given permission to access the information. So far only the TS is authorized to access the database. Russia asked if the database will be translated into OPCW languages; the answer was probably not as it was too great a burden on the translators.

¶6. (U) Iran and India were concerned that the database focuses too much on capacity building, and not enough on protection measures. The TS tried to reassure delegations that protection information is available in the database, further noting the database guidelines were based on decisions made in PrepCom V and VII, in particular PCVII/B/wp.6 Annex B&C. Ultimately, it was decided to change the agenda of April 28; it will instead be an informal interactive session on the database for delegations. Del rep will meet with the UK authors of the paper next week to discuss next steps to move forward on this subject, which might include a paper detailing the exact information delegations need to decide upon before the database is freely available to SPs.

¶7. (U) The Canadian paper generated a detailed response from the Colombian delegation who noted that projects for single SPs are valid measures. They welcome a higher level of information on the activities of the APB, but feel that a formal report is unnecessary citing the annual report, and the DGs report at ECs and CSPs. Further, if a single SP desires more information, it is free to ask the TS for it. They do not agree that the TS needs to provide advanced information to the EC on projects, fearing this could lead to politicization of APB projects. (The facilitator asked for a hard copy of these points, and del rep will get a copy.)

¶8. (U) Russia agreed in general with Colombia, fearing regular detailed reports could be a burden on the TS. Uruguay concurred. India supported the Canadian paper, as did France. Del rep agreed more transparency is needed, but called for periodic briefings over formal reports. Del rep also suggested the TS provide information on outstanding requests for assistance that are not currently being

addressed, to assist in determining if resources are effectively allocated. The facilitator believes there is a two-year backlog of assistance requests. He suggested if the backlog is known then perhaps other SPs could assist on a bilateral basis. Canada reiterated that they do not wish to micromanage the TS. However briefings only help those who can attend meetings and are subject to what attendees report.

Canada feels the TS should judge which is the greater burden. The facilitator said he would discuss this internally with the TS and report back at the next regular meeting.

**¶9.** (U) As stated above, the next meeting on April 28 will be an informal interactive demonstration of the APB database for delegations, and an invitation will be out soon. The briefing on the Joint Assistance Exercise 2005 will be postponed to early May and will include TS participants and a participant from France.

-----  
FINANCIAL RULES  
-----

**¶10.** (U) The Financial Rules consultations were held on April 13, and had three outstanding issues, none of which were resolved. Prior to the meeting Iran requested a pre-meeting with interested delegations to try to resolve the outstanding procurement issues (10.6.04 (D), 10.6.05 (c) and 10.6.06). The facilitator (Snelsire/U.S.) laid out three options: Option 1 - add the terminology "available to all States Parties;" Option 2 - delete the three procurement sections; and Option 3 - use CSP-8 language "available to States Parties of the CWC. Germany took a hard line advocating deletion of these sections (Option 2). They feel they do not belong in the Financial Rules. Iran in turn held to their stand these sections were necessary, that all SPs have a right to understand the equipment that will be used during inspections inside their country, and that the terminology

"available to all States Parties" must remain. They were seconded by India, who supported Option 1. This argument did not deviate in the pre-meeting discussion.

**¶11.** (U) The consultations began covering the same ground as the pre-meeting, procurement issues. Iran and India again stated their desire to retain the "available to all States Parties" terminology, Germany reiterated that procurement language should be deleted. Other delegations tried to swing both sides to Option 3, using various CSP decisions, such as France noting CSP-1, DEC.71, that SPs have the ability to check out all approved equipment and Germany noting CSP-7, DEC.20 which also states "equipment available to States Parties of the CWC." France also noted that CSP-1, DEC.71 has an annex that describes all approved inspection equipment down to the last detail. These citations did not move Iran or India from their stance. In particular India mentioned that these references are all over the place, thus were not helpful.

**¶12.** (U) In the end, Germany agreed to go with Option 3, but by then they had alienated Iran and India to the point they would not budge. Thus there was no further progress on this issue. The facilitator attempted to get agreement from delegations that at the next consultation Option 3 would be a starting point. Although Iran and India did not argue, del rep did not hear them say they would work with Option 3. This issue was closed and discussion began on Para 2.2.01.

**¶13.** (U) 2.2.01 - Interpretation of Financial Rules. Iran believes that if the EC is approving the Financial Rules, then the EC should interpret. Other delegations drew their attention to the second sentence of the proposed rule, which would cover the EC's rights, but Iran remained firm on this. Delegations pointed out that this is micromanaging the DG and could lead to expensive special ECs for interpretations of the rules. Discussion went no-where and was closed. There was no discussion of 1.1.01 - Authority and Applicability.

¶14. (U) The facilitator asked delegations to take to capitals the procurement language and noted that he will talk bilaterally with delegations on the outstanding issues. He noted that the next consultations would be after the May EC.

¶15. (U) Javits sends.  
ARNALL